



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,722	02/12/2004	Mark Allen Grubbs	AUS920031050US1	5922
43307	7590	05/17/2007		
IBM CORP (AP) C/O AMY PATTILLO P. O. BOX 161327 AUSTIN, TX 78716			EXAMINER BLACK, LINH	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/777,722	Applicant(s) GRUBBS ET AL.	
	Examiner LINH BLACK	Art Unit 2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the Applicants' documents dated 10/17/06.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (20020032835), and further in view of McCargar (US 6014674).

As per claim 1, Li et al. teach logical volume – pars. 0052, 0054; adjust an allocated size for a log for a file system in a logical volume – pars. 0018, 0009 (wherein a log structured array can accommodate the size changes in data produced through data compression...), 0013; receiving a request to adjust an inline log for a file system from a current size allocation to a new size allocation while maintaining a size allocation of a logical volume, wherein said inline log and said file system are stored in said logical volume – pars. 0052, 0057; allocating storage space from within said logical volume to

Art Unit: 2163

said inline log according to a storage requirement for said new size allocation – pars. 0063-0064, 0079. However, Li et al. do not teach reformatting said inline log ...McCargar teaches reformatting a log into a space – col. 3, line 53 to col. 4, line 7; col. 16, lines 18-38. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine both teachings in order to allow the log file be reformatted into the allocated space.

As per claim 3, Li et al. teach

adjusting the size of an inline log, wherein receiving a first request to adjust said allocated size for said inline log for said file system from said current size allocation to said new size allocation; detecting that additional storage space is not available for allocation to said logical volume for said first request – pars. 0066, 0069-0071. triggering said request to adjust said allocated size for said inline log for said file system from said current size allocation to said new size allocation while maintaining said size of said logical volume – pars. 0016, 0035.

As per claim 4, Li et al. teach

adjusting the size of an inline log, wherein receiving receiving a first request to adjust an allocated size for said file system from a current file system size allocation to a new file system size allocation - pars. 0018, 0009 (wherein a log structured array can accommodate the size changes in data produced through data compression...), 0013.

Art Unit: 2163

triggering said request to adjust said ...inline log from said current size allocation to said new size allocation to compensate for said first request to adjust said file system from said current file system size to a new file system size - pars. 0052, 0057; pars. 0063-0064, 0079.

As per claim 5, Li et al. teach

shrinking the total storage space allocated to said file system in said logical volume – pars. 0016, 0035.

As per claim 6, Li et al. teach

increasing the total storage space allocated to said file system in said logical volume – pars. 0016-0017.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al.

(20020032835), McCargar (US 6014674), and further in view of Kulatunge et al. (US 6353902).

As per claim 2, Li et al. and McCargar do not teach adjusting the size of an inline log, wherein receiving said request from a system administrator. Kulatunge et al. teach administers and the monitoring of a group of logs – col. 3, lines 19-40; col. 4, last paragraph. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2163

combine Li et al.'s, McCargar's, and Kulatunge et al.'s teachings in order to allow system administrators to adjust logs.

Claims 7-18 rejected based on the same ground of rejection as of claim 1-6.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the Applicants' argument on page 11 that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a controller...for a segment directory; free space within segment may be allocated to a segment directory on page 11; "adjust the size allocation from among a logical volume for a log file" on page 12) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Li teaches a log structured file system – par. 0008; the disk storage space is divided into partitions/logical volumes – pars. 0052-0053 wherein each partition is assigned a particular size.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2163

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH BLACK whose telephone number is 571-272-4106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LINH BLACK
Examiner
Art Unit 2163



May 11, 2007



MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER